4

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT JABALPUR (M.P.)

W.P. No. 3026 /1999

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

PETITIONERS :1. Raipur Truck Owners Association, Through its Secretary Harcharan Singh Sahani, S/o. late Shri Raghubeer Singh Sahani, aged about 50 years, R/o. Gurunanak Nagar, Raipur (M.P.)

2. M/s. Appollo Transport Corporation, Through its Prop. Harcharan Singh Sahani, R/o. Gurunank Nagar, Raipur Dist. Raipur (M.P.)

3. Mohd. Abdul Quadir, S/o. late Shri Abdul Gaffur, aged about 45 years, R/o. behind Gujrati Complex, Moudhapara, Raipur, Dist. Raipur

4. Gupta Hardwares, through its Prop. Shri Pradeep Kumar Gupta, S/o. late Shri M.P. Gupta, aged about 50 years, R/o. Shanti Nagar, Raipur, Dist. Raipur (M.P.)

5. Ashwini Kumar Gupta, S/o. late Shri M.P. Gupta, aged about 48 yrs. R/o. Jalvihar Colony, Raipur, Dist. Raipur (M.P.)

Surendra Kumar Khare S. K. Khare Adv. Jud.

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS :1. Raipur Development Authority, a body incorporated under Section

.. .. 2/-

38 of the Nagar Tatha Gram Nivesh Adhiniyam, having its office at G.E. Road, Raipur, Dist. Raipur (M.P.)

2. The Chairman,
Raipur Development Authority,
Raipur (M.P.)

3. Tehsildar (Recovery Officer),
Raipur Development Authority,
Raipur (M.P.)

PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF AN APPROPRIATE WRIT, ORDER OR DIRECTION ETC.

75

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Single Bench: Hon'ble Shri Satish K. Agnihotri, J.

W. P. No. 3026 of 1999

Petitioners : Raipur Truck Owners Asso. Raipur and Ors.

Versus

Respondents : Raipur Development Authority and two others.

Shri Goutam Bhaduri, counsel for the petitioners.

Shri B.P. Sharma, counsel for respondents No.1 and 2.

Smt. Anju Ahuja, Deputy Government Advocate for the respondent No.3.

ORAL ORDER

(12h May, 2006)

1. I.A. No. 5015/2006, this is an application for withdrawal of the writ petition. Learned counsel appearing for the respondents have no objection, if the application is allowed.

2. In view of the averments made in the application, the application is ordered, as prayed for.

2. Consequently, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge